arXiv:1703.00181v1 [math.FA] 1 Mar 2017

LITTLEWOOD–PALEY THEORY FOR TRIANGLE BUILDINGS

TIM STEGER AND BARTOSZ TROJAN

Abstract. For the natural two parameter filtration $(\mathcal{F}_\lambda : \lambda \in P)$ on the boundary of a triangle building we define a maximal function and a square function and show their boundedness on $L^p(\Omega_0)$ for $p \in (1,\infty)$. At the end we consider $L^p(\Omega_0)$ boundedness of martingale transforms. If the building is of $\mathrm{GL}(3,\mathbb{Q}_p)$ then Ω_0 can be identified with p-adic Heisenberg group.

1. Introduction

Let $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\pi)$ be a σ-finite measure space. A sequence of σ-algebras $(\mathcal{F}_n : n\in\mathbb{Z})$ is a filtration if $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$. Given f a locally integrable function on Ω by $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_n]$ we denote its conditional expectation value with respect to $\mathcal{F}_n$. Let M^* and S denote the maximal function and the square function defined by

$$M^*f = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |f_n|,$$

and

$$Sf = \Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |d_n f|^2\Big)^{1/2}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $d_n f = f_n - f_{n-1}$. The Hardy and Littlewood maximal estimate (see [8]) implies that

$$\pi\big(\{M^*f > \lambda\}\big) \le \lambda^{-1}\int_{M^*f>\lambda} |f|\,\mathrm{d}\pi,$$

from where it is easy to deduce that for $p\in(1,\infty]$

$$\|M^*f\|_{L^p} \le \frac{p}{p-1}\|f\|_{L^p}.$$

For the square function, if $p\in(1,\infty)$ then there is $C_p > 1$ such that

$$C_p^{-1}\|f\|_{L^p} \le \|Sf\|_{L^p} \le C_p\|f\|_{L^p}. \tag{1.2}$$

The inequality (1.2) goes back to Paley [12], and has been reproved in many ways, see for example [2, 3, 4, 7, 10]. Its main application is in proving the L^p-boundedness of martingale transforms (see [2]), that is, for operators of the form

$$Tf = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} a_n d_n f$$

where $(a_n : n\in\mathbb{Z})$ is a sequence of uniformly bounded functions such that a_{n+1} is $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable.

In 1975, Cairoli and Walsh (see [5]) have started to generalize the theory of martingales to two parameter case. Let us recall that a sequence of σ-fields $(\mathcal{F}_{n,m} : n,m\in\mathbb{Z})$ is a two parameter filtration if

$$\mathcal{F}_{n+1,m} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n,m}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{F}_{n,m+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n,m}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then $(f_{n,m} : n,m\in\mathbb{Z})$ is a two parameter martingale if

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{n+1,m}|\mathcal{F}_{n,m}] = f_{n,m}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{E}[f_{n,m+1}|\mathcal{F}_{n,m}] = f_{n,m}. \tag{1.4}$$

Observe that conditions (1.3) and (1.4) impose a structure only for comparable indices. In that generality, it is hard, if not impossible, to build the Littlewood–Paley theory. This lead to the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 22E35, 51E24, 60G42.

Key words and phrases. affine building, Littlewood–Paley theory, square function, maximal function, multi-index filtration, Heisenberg group, p-adic numbers.

introduction of other (smaller) classes of martingales (see [20, 19]). In particular, in [5], Cairoli and Walsh introduced the following condition

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{n,\infty}|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,m}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,m}|\mathcal{F}_{n,\infty}] = f_{n,m} \tag{F_4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{n,\infty} = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{n,m}\Big), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{F}_{\infty,m} = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{n,m}\Big).$$

Under (F_4), the result obtained by Jensen, Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund in [9] implies that the maximal function

$$M^*f = \sup_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} |f_{n,m}| \tag{1.5}$$

is bounded on $L^p(\Omega)$ for $p \in (1,\infty]$. In this context the square function is defined by

$$Sf = \Big(\sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} |d_{n,m}f|^2\Big)^{1/2} \tag{1.6}$$

where $d_{n,m}$ denote the double difference operator, i.e.

$$d_{n,m}f = f_{n,m} - f_{n-1,m} - f_{n,m-1} + f_{n-1,m-1}.$$

In [11], it was observed by Metraux that the boundedness of S on $L^p(\Omega)$ for $p \in (1,\infty)$ is implied by the one parameter Littlewood–Paley theory. Also the concept of a martingale transform has a natural generalization, that is,

$$Tf = \sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} a_{n,m} d_{n,m} f$$

where $(a_{n,m} : n,m \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a sequence of uniformly bounded functions such that $a_{n+1,m+1}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{n,m}$-measurable.

In this article we are interested in a case when the condition (F_4) is not satisfied. The simplest example may be obtained by considering the Heisenberg group together with the non-isotropic two parameter dilations

$$\delta_{s,t}(x,y,z) = (sx, ty, stz).$$

Since in this setup the dyadic cubes do not posses the same properties as the Euclidean cubes, it is more convenient to work on the p-adic version of the Heisenberg group. We observe that this group can be identified with Ω_0, a subset of a boundary of the building of $\mathrm{GL}(3,\mathbb{Q}_p)$ consisting of the points opposite to a given ω_0. The set Ω_0 has a natural two parameter filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{n,m} : n,m \in \mathbb{Z})$ (see Section 2 for details). The maximal function and the square function are defined by (1.5) and (1.6), respectively. The results we obtain are summarized in the following three theorems.

Theorem A. *For each $p \in (1,\infty]$ there is $C_p > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$*

$$\|M^*f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Theorem B. *For each $p \in (1,\infty)$ there is $C_p > 1$ such that for all $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$*

$$C_p^{-1}\|f\|_{L^p} \le \|Sf\|_{L^p} \le C_p\|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Theorem C. *If $(a_{n,m} : n,m \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a sequence of uniformly bounded functions such that $a_{n+1,m+1}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{n,m}$-measurable, then the martingale transform*

$$Tf = \sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} a_{n,m} d_{n,m} f$$

is bounded on $L^p(\Omega_0)$, for all $p \in (1,\infty)$.

Let us briefly describe methods we use. First, we observe that instead of (F_4) the stochastic basis satisfies the remarkable identity (2.2). Based on it we show that the following pointwise estimate holds

$$M^*(|f|) \le C\big(L^*R^*L^*R^*(|f|) + R^*L^*R^*L^*(|f|)\big) \tag{1.7}$$

proving the maximal theorem. Thanks to the two parameter Khintchine's inequality, to bound the square function S, it is enough to show Theorem C. To do so, we define a new square function $\mathcal{S}$ which has a nature similar to the square function used in the presence of (F_4). Then we adapt

the technique developed by Duoandikoetxea and Rubio de Francia in [6] (see Theorem 3). This implies L^p-boundedness of S. Since S does not preserve the L^2 norm, the lower bound requires an extra argument. Namely, we view the square function S as an operator with values in $L^p(\ell^2)$ and take its dual. As a consequence of Theorem 3 and the identity (4.7) the later is bounded on L^p.

Finally, let us comment on the behavior of the maximal function M^* close to L^1. Based on the pointwise estimate (1.7), in view of [8], we conclude that M^* is of weak-type for functions in the Orlicz space $L(\log L)^3$. To better understand the maximal function M^* we investigate exact behavior close to L^1. This together with weighted estimates is the subject of the forthcoming paper. It is also interesting how to extend theorems A, B and C to higher rank and other types of affine buildings.

1.1. **Notation.** For two quantities $A > 0$ and $B > 0$ we say that $A \lesssim B$ ($A \gtrsim B$) if there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$ ($A \geq CB$).

If $\lambda \in P$ we set $|\lambda| = \max\{|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_2|\}$.

2. Triangle buildings

2.1. **Coxeter complex.** We recall basic facts about the A_2 root system and the $\tilde{A}_2$ Coxeter group. A general reference is [1]. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^3$ defined as

$$\mathfrak{a} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0\}.$$

We denote by $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ the canonical orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$ with respect to the standard scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We set $\alpha_1 = e_2 - e_1$, $\alpha_2 = e_3 - e_2$, $\alpha_0 = e_3 - e_1$ and $I = \{0, 1, 2\}$. The A_2 root system is defined by

$$\Phi = \{\pm\alpha_0, \pm\alpha_1, \pm\alpha_2\}.$$

We choose the base $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ of Φ. The corresponding positive roots are $\Phi^+ = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Denote by $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ the basis dual to $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$; its elements are called the *fundamental co-weights*. Their integer combinations, form the *co-weight lattice* P. As in Figure 1, we always draw λ_1 pointing



Figure 1. A_2 root system

up and to the left and λ_2 up and to the right. Likewise $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ is drawn pointing directly left, while $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1$ points directly right. Because $\langle \lambda_1, \alpha_0 \rangle = \langle \lambda_2, \alpha_0 \rangle = 1$, we see that for any $\lambda \in P$ the expression $\langle \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle$ represents the vertical level of λ. For $\lambda = i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$, that level is $i + j$.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the family of affine hyperplanes, called *walls*,

$$H_{j;k} = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_j \rangle = k\}$$

where $j \in I$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. To each wall $H_{j;k}$ we associate $r_{j;k}$ the orthogonal reflection in $\mathfrak{a}$, i.e.

$$r_{j;k}(x) = x - \big(\langle x, \alpha_j \rangle - k\big)\alpha_j.$$

Set $r_1 = r_{1;0}$, $r_2 = r_{2;0}$ and $r_0 = r_{0;1}$. The *finite Weyl group* W_0 is the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{a})$ generated by r_1 and r_2. The *affine Weyl group* W is the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathfrak{a})$ generated by r_0, r_1 and r_2.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the family of open connected components of $\mathfrak{a} \setminus \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H$. The elements of $\mathcal{C}$ are called *chambers*. By C_0 we denote the fundamental chamber, i.e.

$$C_0 = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_1 \rangle > 0, \langle x, \alpha_2 \rangle > 0, \langle x, \alpha_0 \rangle < 1\}.$$

The group W acts simply transitively on $\mathcal{C}$. Moreover, $\overline{C_0}$ is a fundamental domain for the action of W on $\mathfrak{a}$ (see e.g. [1, VI, §1-3]). The vertices of C_0 are $\{0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$. The set of all vertices of all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is denoted by $V(\Sigma)$. Under the action of W, $V(\Sigma)$ is made up of three orbits, $W(0)$, $W(\lambda_1)$, and $W(\lambda_2)$. Vertices in the same orbit are said to have the same *type*. Any chamber $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has one vertex in each orbit or in other words one vertex of each of the three types.

The family $\mathcal{C}$ may be regarded as a simplicial complex Σ by taking as the simplexes all non-empty subsets of vertices of C, for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Two chambers C and C' are *i-adjacent* for $i \in I$ if $C = C'$ or if there is $w \in W$ such that $C = wC_0$ and $C' = wr_iC_0$. Since $r_i^2 = 1$ this defines an equivalence relation.

The *fundamental sector* is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_1 \rangle > 0, \langle x, \alpha_2 \rangle > 0\}.$$

Given $\lambda \in P$ and $w \in W_0$ the set $\lambda + w\mathcal{S}_0$ is called a *sector* in Σ with *base vertex* λ. The angle spanned by a sector at its base vertex is $\pi/3$.

2.2. **The definition of triangle buildings.** For the theory of affine buildings we refer the reader to [13]. See also the first author's expository paper [14], for an elementary introduction to the p-adics, and to precisely the sort of the buildings which this paper deals with.

A simplicial complex $\mathscr{X}$ is an $\tilde{A}_2$ *building*, or as we like to call it, a *triangle building*, if each of its vertices is assigned one of the three types, and if it contains a family of subcomplexes called *apartments* such that

(i) each apartment is type-isomorphic to Σ,
(ii) any two simplexes of $\mathscr{X}$ lie in a common apartment,
(iii) for any two apartments $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{A}'$ having a chamber in common there is a type-preserving isomorphism $\psi : \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{A}'$ fixing $\mathscr{A} \cap \mathscr{A}'$ pointwise.

We assume also that the system of apartments is *complete*, meaning that any subcomplex of $\mathscr{X}$ type-isomorphic to Σ is an apartment. A simplex C is a *chamber* in $\mathscr{X}$ if it is a chamber for some apartment. Two chambers of $\mathscr{X}$ are *i-adjacent* if they are i-adjacent in some apartment. For $i \in I$ and for a chamber C of $\mathscr{X}$ let $q_i(C)$ be equal to

$$q_i(C) = |\{C' \in \mathscr{X} : C' \sim_i C\}| - 1.$$

It may be proved that $q_i(C)$ is independent of C and of i. Denote the common value by q, and assume local finiteness: $q < \infty$. Any *edge* of $\mathscr{X}$, i.e., any 1-simplex, is contained in precisely $q+1$ chambers.

It follows from the axioms that the ball of radius one about any vertex x of $\mathscr{X}$ is made up of x itself, which is of one type, q^2+q+1 vertices of a second type, and a further q^2+q+1 vertices of the third type. Moreover, adjacency between vertices of the second and third types makes them into, respectively, the points and the lines of a finite projective plane.

A subcomplex $\mathscr{S}$ is called a *sector* of $\mathscr{X}$ if it is a sector in some apartment. Two sectors are called *equivalent* if they contain a common subsector. Let Ω denote the set of equivalence classes of sectors. If x is a vertex of $\mathscr{X}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, there is a unique sector denoted $[x, \omega]$ which has base vertex x and represents ω.

Given any two points ω and $\omega' \in \Omega$, one can find two sectors representing them which lie in a common apartment. If that apartment is unique, we say that ω and ω' are *opposite*, and denote the unique apartment by $[\omega, \omega']$. In fact ω and ω' are opposite precisely when the two sectors in the common apartment point in opposite directions in the Euclidean sense.

2.3. **Filtrations.** We fix once and for all an origin vertex $O \in \mathscr{X}$ and a point $\omega_0 \in \Omega$. Choose O so that it has the same type as the origin of Σ. Let $\mathscr{S}_0 = [O, \omega_0]$ be the sector representing ω_0 with base vertex O. By Ω_0 we denote the subset of Ω consisting of ω's opposite to ω_0. For purposes of motivation only, we recall that if $\mathscr{X}$ is the building of $\mathrm{GL}(3, \mathbb{Q}_p)$, then Ω_0 can be identified with the p-adic Heisenberg group (see Appendix A for details).

Let $\mathscr{A}_0$ be any apartment containing $\mathscr{S}_0$. By ψ we denote the type-preserving isomorphism between $\mathscr{A}_0$ and Σ such that $\psi(\mathscr{S}_0) = -S_0$. We set $\rho = \psi \circ \rho_0$ where ρ_0 is the retraction from $\mathscr{X}$ to $\mathscr{A}_0$. With these definitions, $\rho : \mathscr{X} \to \Sigma$ is a type-preserving simplicial map, and for any $\omega \in \Omega_0$ the apartment $[\omega, \omega_0]$ maps bijectively to Σ with ω_0 mapping to the bottom (of FIGURE 1) and ω mapping to the top.

For any vertex x of $\mathscr{X}$ define the subset $E_x \subset \Omega_0$ to consist of all ω's such that x belongs to $[\omega, \omega_0]$; an equivalent condition is that $[x, \omega_0] \subseteq [\omega, \omega_0]$. Fix $\lambda \in P$. By $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ we denote the σ-field generated by sets E_x for $x \in \mathscr{X}$ with $\rho(x) = \lambda$. There are countably many such x, and the corresponding sets E_x are mutually disjoint, hence $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ is a countably generated atomic σ-field.

Let $\preceq$ denote the partial order on P where $\lambda \preceq \mu$ if and only if $\langle \lambda - \mu, \alpha_1 \rangle \leq 0$ and $\langle \lambda - \mu, \alpha_2 \rangle \leq 0$. If we draw and orient Σ as in FIGURE 1, then $\lambda \preceq \mu$ exactly when μ lies in the sector pointing upwards from λ.

Proposition 2.1. *If $\lambda \preceq \mu$ then $\mathcal{F}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$.*

Proof. Choose any vertex x so that $\rho(x) = \mu$. Because $\lambda \preceq \mu$, there is a unique vertex y in the sector $[x, \omega_0]$ so that $\rho(y) = \lambda$. For any $\omega \in E_x$, the apartment $[\omega, \omega_0]$ contains x, hence it contains $[x, \omega_0]$, hence it contains y. This establishes that $E_x \subseteq E_y$. In other words, each atom of $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ is a subset of some atom of $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$. Hence each atom of $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ is a disjoint union of atoms of $\mathcal{F}_\mu$. □

In fact, Proposition 2.1 says that $(\mathcal{F}_\lambda : \lambda \in P) = (\mathcal{F}_{i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2} : i, j \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a two parameter filtration. Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_{\lambda \in P} \mathcal{F}_\lambda \Big).$$

Let π denote the unique σ-additive measure on $(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F})$ such that for $E_x \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda$

$$\pi(E_x) = q^{-2\langle \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle}.$$

All σ-fields in this paper should be extended so as to include π-null sets.

A function $f(\omega)$ on Ω_0 is $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$-measurable if it depends only on that part of the apartment $[\omega, \omega_0]$ which retracts under ρ to the sector pointing downwards from λ. For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ set

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty} = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_{j' \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{i\lambda_1 + j'\lambda_2} \Big), \qquad \mathcal{F}_{\infty,j} = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_{i' \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{i'\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2} \Big).$$

A function $f(\omega)$ on Ω_0 is $\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}$-measurable (respectively $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}$-measurable) if it depends only on that part of the apartment which retracts to a certain "lower" half-plane with boundary parallel to λ_2 (respectively λ_1).

If $\mathcal{F}'$ is σ-subfield of $\mathcal{F}$, we denote by $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}']$ the Radon–Nikodym derivative with respect to $\mathcal{F}'$. If $\mathcal{F}''$ is another σ-subfield of $\mathcal{F}$ we write

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}'|\mathcal{F}''] = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}']\big|\mathcal{F}''\big].$$

The σ-field generated by $\mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{F}''$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}' \vee \mathcal{F}''$. We write $f_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_\lambda f = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda]$ for $\lambda \in P$. If $\lambda \preceq \mu$, then it follows from Proposition 2.1 that $\mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\mu = \mathbb{E}_\lambda$.

We note that the Cairoli–Walsh condition (F_4) introduced in [5] is not satisfied, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_1} \mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_2} \neq \mathbb{E}_\lambda.$$

Instead of (F_4) we have

Lemma 2.2. *For a locally integrable function f on Ω_0*

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{\lambda+\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_1}] = q^{-1} f_{\lambda+\lambda_1} - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}[f_{\lambda+\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_1-\lambda_2} \vee \mathcal{F}_\lambda] + f_\lambda, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\big(\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_1}\big)^2 = q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+\lambda_1} + (1 - q^{-1})\mathbb{E}_\lambda, \tag{2.2}$$

and likewise if we exchange λ_1 and λ_2.

Proof. For the proof of (2.1) it is enough to consider $f = \mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}$ where p_1 is a vertex in $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\rho(p_1) = \lambda + \lambda_1$. Let $\mathscr{S}$ be the sector $[p_1, \omega_0]$ and let x be the unique vertex of $\mathscr{S}$ with $\rho(x) = \lambda$. The ball in $\mathscr{X}$ of radius 1 around x has the structure of a finite projective plane. In FIGURE 2



FIGURE 2. Residue of x

the spot marked x is for vertices of $\mathscr{X}$ which retract via ρ to λ. Recall that E_x is an atom of the σ-field $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$. The spot marked p_1 is for vertices retracting to $\lambda + \lambda_1$; the spot marked l is for vertices retracting to $\lambda + \lambda_2$; the spot marked l_1 is for vertices retracting to $\lambda + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$; etc. In the ball of radius 1 around x, only x itself retracts to the spot marked x. The line type vertex known as l_0 is the only vertex in the ball retracting to its spot; q line type vertices retract to the same spot as l_1; the remaining q^2 line type vertices retract to the spot marked l. Likewise, p_0 is the unique point type vertex of the ball retracting to its spot; q point type vertices retract to the spot marked p; q^2 retract to the same spot as p_1. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} | \mathcal{F}_\lambda] = q^{-2} \mathbf{1}_{E_x} = q^{-2} \sum_{p' \not\sim l_0} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}} = q^{-2} \sum_{l \not\sim p_0} \mathbf{1}_{E_l}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_1-\lambda_2} \vee \mathcal{F}_\lambda] = q^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_x \cap E_{l_1}} = q^{-1} \sum_{\substack{p' \sim l_1 \\ p' \not\sim l_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}}$$

where p' runs through the point type vertices of the ball, l runs through the line type vertices of the ball, and $\sim$ stands for the incidence relation. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_2}] = q^{-1} \sum_{\substack{l \sim p_1 \\ l \not\sim p_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_l}. \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_2} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_1}] = q^{-2} \sum_{\substack{l \sim p_1 \\ l \not\sim p_0}} \sum_{\substack{p' \sim l \\ p' \not\sim l_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}} &= q^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} + q^{-2} \sum_{\substack{p' \not\sim l_0 \\ p' \not\sim l_1}} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}} \\ &= q^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} + q^{-2} \sum_{p' \not\sim l_0} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}} - q^{-2} \sum_{\substack{p' \sim l_1 \\ p' \not\sim l_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_{p'}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

which finishes the proof of (2.1). Applying one more average to the next to the last expression of (2.4) we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_2} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_1} | \mathcal{F}_{\lambda+\lambda_2}] = q^{-2} \sum_{\substack{l \sim p_1 \\ l \not\sim p_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_l} + q^{-3} \sum_{\substack{p' \not\sim l_0 \\ p' \not\sim l_1}} \sum_{\substack{l \sim p' \\ l \not\sim p_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_l}.$$

For any line $l \not\sim p_0$ there are q points p' such that $p' \sim l$ and $p' \not\sim l_0$ and among them there is exactly one incident to l_1. Hence in the last sum each line $l \not\sim p_0$ appears $q - 1$ times. Thus, we

can write

$$q^{-3}\sum_{\substack{p'\not\sim l_0\\ p'\not\sim l_1}}\sum_{\substack{l\sim p'\\ l\not\sim p_0}}=q^{-3}(q-1)\sum_{l\not\sim p_0}\mathbf{1}_{E_l}=(1-q^{-1})\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda]$$

proving (2.2). □

The following lemma describes the composition of projections on the same level.

Lemma 2.3. *If $k,j\in\mathbb{Z}$ are such that $k\geq j\geq 0$ or $k\leq j\leq 0$ then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbb{E}_\lambda=\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+j(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbb{E}_\lambda. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. We do the proof for $k\geq j\geq 0$. For any $\omega\in\Omega_0$, there is a connected chain of vertices $(x_i:0\leq i\leq k)\subseteq[\omega,\omega_0]$ with $\rho(x_i)=\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)$. Suppose, conversely, that $(x_i:0\leq i\leq k)$ is a connected chain of vertices and that $\rho(x_i)=\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)$. Construct a subcomplex $\mathscr{B}\subset\mathscr{X}$ by putting together $([x_i,\omega_0]:0\leq i\leq k)$, the edges between the x_i's and the triangles pointing downwards from those edges to ω_0. Referring to FIGURE 3, the extra triangle pointing downward from the first edge has vertices x_0, x_1, and y_0. Note that $[x_0,\omega_0]\cap[x_1,\omega_0]=[y_0,\omega_0]$. Proceeding one step at a time, one may verify that the restriction of ρ to $\mathscr{B}$ is an injection and that $\mathscr{B}$ and $\rho(\mathscr{B})$ are isomorphic complexes.



FIGURE 3. The complex $\mathscr{B}$

By basic properties of affine buildings, one knows it is possible to extend $\mathscr{B}$ to an apartment. Any such apartment will retract bijectively to Σ, and will be of the form form $[\omega,\omega_0]$ where ω is the equivalence class represented by the upward pointing sectors of the apartment. Moreover, using the definition of π one may calculate that

$$\pi(\{\omega\in\Omega_0:\mathscr{B}\subseteq[\omega,\omega_0]\})=q^{-2\langle\lambda,\alpha_0\rangle-k}.$$

The important point is that the measure of the set depends only on the level of λ and the length of the chain.

Basic properties of affine buildings imply that any apartment containing x_0 and x_k contains the entire chain. Hence

$$\pi(E_{x_0}\cap E_{x_k})=\pi(\{\omega\in\Omega_0:\mathscr{B}\subseteq[\omega,\omega_0]\})=q^{-2\langle\lambda,\alpha_0\rangle-k}.$$

Fix x_0. Proceeding one step at a time, one sees there are q^k connected chains $(x_i:0\leq i\leq k)$ with $\rho(x_i)=\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)$. Consequently

$$\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbf{1}_{x_0}=q^{-k}\sum_{(x_i:0\leq i\leq k)}\mathbf{1}_{x_k}.$$

Likewise

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+j(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\mathbf{1}_{x_0}&=q^{-j}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\sum_{(x_i:0\leq i\leq j)}\mathbf{1}_{x_j}\\&=q^{-j}q^{-(k-j)}\sum_{(x_i:0\leq i\leq j)}\sum_{(x_i:j\leq i\leq k)}\mathbf{1}_{x_k},\end{aligned}$$

which is the same thing. □

Consider $\mathbb{E}_\lambda\mathbb{E}_\mu$. If $\lambda\preceq\mu$ then the product is equal to $\mathbb{E}_\lambda$; similarly if $\mu\preceq\lambda$. If λ and μ are incomparable, the following lemma allows us to reduce to the case where λ and μ are on the same level.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose* $\lambda \in P$ *and*

$$\lambda' = \lambda - i\lambda_1, \qquad \mu = \lambda' + k(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1), \qquad \tilde{\mu} = \mu + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)$$

for $i, k \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then for any locally integrable function* f *on* Ω_0

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu], \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_\lambda] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}], \tag{2.7}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu \vee \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mu}}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] \tag{2.8}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu \vee \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mu}}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}] \tag{2.9}$$

and likewise if we exchange λ_1 *and* λ_2.

Proof. We first prove (2.6) for $i = 1$ and $k = 1$. Because $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}]$, it is sufficient to consider $f = \mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}$ where $\rho(p_1) = \lambda$. Use FIGURE 2 to fix the notation, and note that if p_1 retracts to λ, then x retracts to λ' and p to μ. One calculates:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = q^{-3}\sum_{\substack{p\sim l_0\\ p\neq p_0}} \mathbf{1}_{E_p} &= q^{-2}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_x}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{E_{p_1}}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu].\end{aligned}$$

Next consider the case $i = 1$, $k > 1$. Set $\mu' = \mu + \lambda_1$, $\nu = \mu + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $\nu' = \nu + \lambda_1$ (see FIGURE 4). Since $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ is a subfield of $\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu].$$

Thus, applying Lemma 2.3 we obtain



FIGURE 4.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_\mu]\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the case $k = 1$. Now apply induction on k and Lemma 2.3 again to get

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu].$$

To extend to the case $i > 1$, use induction on i and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'+\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'+\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu].\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2.8) is analogous, starting with the case $i = 1$, $k = 0$. Identity (2.6) can be read as $\mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_{\lambda'}$. The expectation operators are orthogonal projections with respect to the usual inner product, and taking adjoints gives $\mathbb{E}_\lambda\mathbb{E}_\mu = \mathbb{E}_{\lambda'}\mathbb{E}_\mu$ which is (2.7). To be more precise, one takes the inner product of either side of (2.7) with some nice test function, applies self-adjointness, and reduces to (2.6). Likewise, (2.9) follows from (2.8). □

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose* $\lambda = i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$, $\mu = \lambda + k(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$. *Then for any locally integrable function* f *on* Ω_0

$$\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_\lambda] = \begin{cases}\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}] & \text{if } k \geq 0,\\ \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}] & \text{if } k \leq 0.\end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose $k \geq 0$. By Lemma 2.4 for any $j' \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_{\lambda + j'\lambda_2} = \mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_\lambda.$$

So if g is $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+j'\lambda_2}$-measurable and compactly supported, then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle g, \mathbb{E}_{i,\infty}\mathbb{E}_\mu f\rangle = \langle \mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_{i,\infty} g, f\rangle &= \langle \mathbb{E}_\mu g, f\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_{\lambda+j'\lambda_2} g, f\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbb{E}_\mu \mathbb{E}_\lambda g, f\rangle = \langle g, \mathbb{E}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\mu f\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The test functions g which we use are sufficient to distinguish between one $\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}$-measurable function and another. Since $\mathbb{E}_{i,\infty}\mathbb{E}_\mu f$ and $\mathbb{E}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\mu f$ are both $\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}$-measurable the proof is done. □

3. Littlewood-Paley theory

3.1. **Maximal functions.** The natural maximal function M^* for a locally integrable function f on Ω_0 is defined by

$$M^* f = \max_{\lambda \in P} |f_\lambda|.$$

Additionally, we define two auxiliary single parameter maximal functions

$$L^* f = \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}[\,|f|\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}], \qquad R^* f = \max_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}[\,|f|\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}].$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda \in P$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any non-negative locally integrable function f on Ω_0*

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda+k\lambda_1}\right)^2 f \geq (1-q^{-1})\mathbb{E}_\lambda f.$$

Proof. We may assume $\lambda = 0$. Let us define (see Figure 5)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu = k\lambda_1, && \mu' = \lambda_1 + (k-1)\lambda_2, && \mu'' = k\lambda_2,\\ &\nu = (k-1)\lambda_1, && \nu' = \lambda_1 + (k-2)\lambda_2, && \nu'' = (k-1)\lambda_2.\end{aligned}$$

We show



Figure 5.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_{\mu'}\mathbb{E}_\mu = \mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu\mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu\mathbb{E}_{\nu'}\mathbb{E}_\nu. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $g = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu]$. By two applications of Lemma 2.3 we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu]$$

and by Lemma 2.2

$$\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}] = q^{-1}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}] + \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}] - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'} \vee \mathcal{F}_{\nu''}].$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] = \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'} \vee \mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}].$$

By repeated application of Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'} \vee \mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}] &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu'}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'} \vee \mathcal{F}_{\nu''}|\mathcal{F}_\mu|\mathcal{F}_{\mu''}]\\ &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu'}|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu''}]\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (3.1). By iteration of (3.1) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_\mu\mathbb{E}_{\mu'}\mathbb{E}_\mu = \mathbb{E}_{\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_1} - q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_1}$$

which together with Lemma 2.2 implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_{\mu}\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_{\mu} = q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mu''}\mathbb{E}_{\mu}\mathbb{E}_{\mu'}\mathbb{E}_{\mu} + (1-q^{-1})\mathbb{E}_0. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 1. *For each $p \in (1,\infty]$ there is $C_p > 0$ such that*

$$\|L^* f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}, \qquad \|R^* f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\|M^* f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Inequalities (3.2) are two instances of Doob's well-known maximal inequality for single parameter martingales (see e.g. [15]). To show (3.3) consider a non-negative $f \in L^p(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_\mu)$. Fix $\lambda \in P$. Since $f \in L^p(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_{\mu'})$ for any $\mu' \succeq \mu$ we may assume $\mu \succeq \lambda$. Let

$$\nu = \lambda + \langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle \lambda_1, \qquad \nu'' = \lambda + \langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle \lambda_2.$$

By Lemma 3.1

$$(1-q^{-1})\mathbb{E}_\lambda f \le \mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu \mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu f.$$

If $\lambda = i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$, then repeated application of Lemma 2.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu\mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu f = \mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu\mathbb{E}_{\nu''}\mathbb{E}_\nu\mathbb{E}_\mu f &= \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}|\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}|\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}] \\ &\le L^*R^*L^*R^* f.\end{aligned}$$

By taking the supremum over $\lambda \in P$ we get

$$(1-q^{-1})M^* f \le L^*R^*L^*R^* f.$$

Hence, by (3.2) we obtain (3.3) for $f \in L^p(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_\mu)$. Finally, a standard Fatou's lemma argument establishes the theorem for arbitrary $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$. $\square$

3.2. **Square function.** Let f be a locally integrable function on Ω_0. Given $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define projections

$$L_i f = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}] - \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{i-1,\infty}], \quad R_j f = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j}] - \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j-1}].$$

Note that L_i (respectively R_j) is the martingale difference operator for the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty} : i \in \mathbb{Z})$ (respectively $(\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j} : j \in \mathbb{Z})$). For $\lambda = i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$ we set

$$D_\lambda f = L_i R_j f, \qquad D^\star_\lambda f = R_j L_i f.$$

The following development is inspired by that of Stein and Street in [17]. We start by defining the corresponding square function.

$$\mathcal{S} f = \Big(\sum_{\lambda \in P} |D_\lambda f|^2 \Big)^{1/2}.$$

We will also need its dual counterpart

$$\mathcal{S}^\star f = \Big(\sum_{\lambda \in P} |D^\star_\lambda f|^2 \Big)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 2. *For every $p \in (1,\infty)$ there is $C_p > 1$ such that*

$$C_p^{-1}\|f\|_{L^p} \le \|\mathcal{S} f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}, \qquad C_p^{-1}\|f\|_{L^p} \le \|\mathcal{S}^\star f\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Moreover, on $L^2(\Omega_0)$ square functions $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^\star$ preserve the norm.

Proof. Since

$$S_L(f) = \Big(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |L_i f|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad S_R(f) = \Big(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |R_j f|^2 \Big)^{1/2}$$

preserve the norm on $L^2(\Omega_0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}} |L_i R_j f|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\pi &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |L_i R_j f|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\pi \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int |R_j f|^2 d\pi = \int |f|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\pi.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{S}$ preserves the norm.

For $p \neq 2$ we use the two parameter Khintchine inequality (see [12]) and bounds on single parameter martingale transforms (see [2, 15, 18]). Let $(\epsilon_i : i \in \mathbb{Z})$ and $(\epsilon'_j : j \in \mathbb{Z})$ be sequences of real numbers, with absolute values bounded above by 1. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider the operator

$$T_N = \sum_{|i|,|j|\leq N} \epsilon_i \epsilon'_j D_{i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2}$$

which may be written as a composition $\mathcal{L}_N \mathcal{R}_N$ where

$$\mathcal{L}_N = \sum_{|i|\leq N} \epsilon_i L_i, \quad \mathcal{R}_N = \sum_{|j|\leq N} \epsilon'_j R_j.$$

Since by Burkholder's inequality (see [2, 15]) the operators $\mathcal{R}_N$ and $\mathcal{L}_N$ are bounded on $L^p(\Omega_0)$ with bounds uniform in N we have

$$\|T_N f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Setting r_k to be the Rademacher function, by Khintchine's inequality we get

$$\int \Big(\sum_{|i|,|j|\leq N} |D_{i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2} f|^2 \Big)^{p/2} \,\mathrm{d}\pi \lesssim \int \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \Big| \sum_{|i|,|j|\leq N} r_i(s) r_j(t) D_{i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2} f \Big|^p \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}\pi,$$

which is bounded by $\|f\|_{L^p}^p$. Finally, let N approach infinity and use the monotone convergence theorem to get

$$\|\mathcal{S} f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

For the opposite inequality, we take $f \in L^p(\Omega_0) \cap L^2(\Omega_0)$ and $g \in L^{p'}(\Omega_0) \cap L^2(\Omega_0)$ where $1/p' + 1/p = 1$. By polarization of (3.4) and the Cauchy–Schwarz and Hölder inequalities we obtain

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int \sum_{\lambda \in P} D_\lambda f \overline{D_\lambda g} \,\mathrm{d}\pi \leq \langle \mathcal{S} f, \mathcal{S} g \rangle \leq \|\mathcal{S} f\|_{L^p} \|\mathcal{S} g\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{S} f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^{p'}}. \qquad \square$$

Given a set $\{v_\lambda : \lambda \in P\}$ of vectors in a Banach space, we say that $\sum_{\lambda \in P} v_\lambda$ converges *unconditionally* if, whenever we choose a bijection $\phi : \mathbb{N} \to P$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_{\phi(n)} \qquad \text{exists, and is independent of } \phi.$$

Equivalently, we may ask that for any increasing, exhaustive sequence $(F_N : N \in \mathbb{N})$ of finite subsets of P, the limit

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{\lambda \in F_N} v_\lambda \qquad \text{exists.}$$

The following proposition provides a Calderón reproducing formula.

Proposition 3.2. *For each $p \in (1, \infty)$ and any $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$,*

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \in P} D_\lambda D_\lambda^\star f$$

where the sum converges in $L^p(\Omega_0)$ unconditionally.

Proof. Fix an increasing and exhaustive sequence $(F_N : N \in \mathbb{N})$ of finite subsets of P. Let

$$I_N(f) = \sum_{\lambda \in F_N} D_\lambda D_\lambda^\star f.$$

For $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$ and $g \in L^{p'}(\Omega_0)$, where $1/p + 1/p' = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle I_N(f) - I_M(f), g \rangle| &= \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in F_N \setminus F_M} \langle D_\lambda^\star f, D_\lambda^\star g \rangle \Big| \\ &\leq \Big\| \Big(\sum_{\lambda \in F_N \setminus F_M} (D_\lambda^\star f)^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big\|_{L^p} \|\mathcal{S}^\star(g)\|_{L^{p'}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

In particular,

$$|\langle I_N(f), g \rangle| \leq \|\mathcal{S}^\star(f)\|_{L^p} \|\mathcal{S}^\star(g)\|_{L^{p'}},$$

whence $\|I_N(f)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}$ uniformly in N. Consequently, it is enough to prove convergence for $f \in L^p(\Omega_0) \cap L^2(\Omega_0)$. From (3.5) and the bounded convergence theorem it follows that for any positive ϵ, $\|I_N(f) - I_M(f)\|_{L^p} \leq \epsilon$ whenever M and N are large enough. This shows that the limit exists. Finally, for $g \in L^{p'}(\Omega_0) \cap L^2(\Omega_0)$, the polarized version of (3.4) gives

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \langle I_N(f), g\rangle = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{\lambda\in F_N} \langle D_\lambda^\star f, D_\lambda^\star g\rangle = \langle f, g\rangle. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 3. *Let $(T_\lambda : \lambda \in P)$ be a family of operators such that for some $\delta > 0$ and $p_0 \in (1,2)$*

$$\|T_\lambda\|_{L^1\to L^1} \lesssim 1, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\|T_\mu T_\lambda^\star\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\mu-\lambda|} \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_\mu^\star T_\lambda\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\mu-\lambda|}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\|D_\lambda T_\mu D_{\lambda'}\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\lambda-\mu|} q^{-\delta|\lambda'-\mu|}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\big\|\sup_{\lambda\in P} |T_\lambda f_\lambda|\big\|_{L^{p_0}} \lesssim \big\|\sup_{\lambda\in P} |f_\lambda|\big\|_{L^{p_0}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Then for any $p \in (p_0, 2]$ the sum $\sum_{\lambda\in P} T_\lambda$ converges unconditionally in the strong operator topology for operators on $L^p(\Omega_0)$.

Proof. First, recall that the Cotlar–Stein Lemma (see e.g. [16]) states that (3.7) implies the unconditional convergence of $\sum_{\lambda\in P} T_\lambda$ in the strong operator topology on $L^2(\Omega_0)$. Let $(F_N : N \in \mathbb{N})$ be an arbitrary increasing and exhaustive sequence of finite subsets of P. For $N > 0$ we set

$$V_N = \sum_{\mu\in F_N} T_\mu, \qquad\qquad I_N = \sum_{\lambda\in F_N} D_\lambda D_\lambda^\star.$$

By (3.6), (3.7) and interpolation, each T_μ is bounded on L^p for $p \in [1,2]$ and the same holds for the finite sum V_N. We consider $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$ for $p \in (p_0, 2)$. By Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\|V_M I_N(f)\big\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \big\|\mathcal{S}\big(V_M I_N(f)\big)\big\|_{L^p} = \Big\|\Big(\sum_{\mu\in F_M}\sum_{\lambda'\in F_N} D_\lambda T_\mu D_{\lambda'} D_{\lambda'}^\star f : \lambda \in P\Big)\Big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \\
&= \Big\|\Big(\sum_{\gamma,\gamma'\in P} \mathbf{1}_{F_N}(\lambda+\gamma+\gamma')\mathbf{1}_{F_M}(\lambda+\gamma) D_\lambda T_{\lambda+\gamma} D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'}^\star f : \lambda \in P\Big)\Big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma,\gamma'\in P} \big\|\big(\mathbf{1}_{F_N}(\lambda+\gamma+\gamma')\mathbf{1}_{F_M}(\lambda+\gamma) D_\lambda T_{\lambda+\gamma} D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'}^\star f : \lambda \in P\big)\big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by change of variables we get

$$\big\|V_M I_N(f)\big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \sum_{\gamma,\gamma'\in P} \big\|\big(D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} T_{\lambda+\gamma} D_\lambda D_\lambda^\star f : \lambda \in F_N\big)\big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)}.$$

Assuming there is $\delta_p > 0$ such that

$$\|(D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} T_{\lambda+\gamma} D_\lambda f_\lambda : \lambda \in P)\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \lesssim q^{-\delta_p(|\gamma|+|\gamma'|)} \|(f_\lambda : \lambda \in P)\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \tag{3.10}$$

we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\|V_M I_N(f)\big\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \sum_{\gamma,\gamma'\in P} q^{-\delta_p(|\gamma|+|\gamma'|)} \|(D_\lambda^\star f : \lambda \in F_N)\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \\
&\lesssim \Big\|\Big(\sum_{\lambda\in F_N} (D_\lambda^\star f)^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_{L^p}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Theorem 2, Proposition 3.2 and (3.11) imply that the V_M are uniformly bounded on L^p.

For the proof of (3.10), we consider an operator $\mathcal{T}$ defined for $\vec{f} \in L^p\big(\pi, \ell^2(P)\big)$ by

$$\mathcal{T}\vec{f} = \big(D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} T_{\lambda+\gamma} D_\lambda f_\lambda : \lambda \in P\big).$$

Since $\|D_\lambda\|_{L^1\to L^1} \lesssim 1$ and $\|T_\mu\|_{L^1\to L^1} \lesssim 1$ we have

$$\big\|\mathcal{T}\vec{f}\,\big\|_{L^1(\ell^1)} \lesssim \big\|\vec{f}\,\big\|_{L^1(\ell^1)}.$$

Also, by (3.8), we can estimate

$$\left\|\mathcal{T}\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^2(\ell^2)}^2 = \sum_{\lambda\in P}\|D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'}T_{\lambda+\gamma}D_\lambda f_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim q^{-\delta(|\gamma|+|\gamma'|)}\sum_{\lambda\in P}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Therefore, using interpolation between $L^1\left(\pi,\ell^1(P)\right)$ and $L^2\left(\pi,\ell^2(P)\right)$ we obtain that there is $\delta'>0$ such that

$$\left\|\mathcal{T}\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^{p_0})} \lesssim q^{-\delta'(|\gamma|+|\gamma'|)}\left\|\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^{p_0})}.$$

Because $|D_\lambda g| \lesssim L^*R^*(|g|)$, and because Theorem 1 says that L^* and R^* are bounded on L^{p_0}, we know that $(D_\lambda : \lambda\in P)$ is bounded on $L^{p_0}(\pi,\ell^\infty(P))$. Of course the same holds for $(D_{\lambda+\gamma+\gamma'} : \lambda\in P)$. Hence, by (3.9) we get

$$\left\|\mathcal{T}\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^\infty)} \lesssim \left\|\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^\infty)}.$$

Next, interpolating between $L^{p_0}\left(\pi,\ell^{p_0}(P)\right)$ and $L^{p_0}\left(\pi,\ell^\infty(P)\right)$ gives a $\delta''>0$ such that

$$\left\|\mathcal{T}\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^2)} \lesssim q^{-\delta''(|\gamma|+|\gamma'|)}\left\|\vec{f}\,\right\|_{L^{p_0}(\ell^2)}.$$

Finally, interpolating between $L^{p_0}\left(\pi,\ell^2(P)\right)$ and $L^2\left(\pi,\ell^2(P)\right)$ we obtain (3.10).

To finish the proof, we are going to show that $(V_Nf : N\in\mathbb{N})$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(\Omega_0)$. Let us consider $g\in L^p(\Omega_0)\cap L^2(\Omega_0)$. Setting

$$a=\frac{2(p-p_0)}{4-p-p_0},\quad\text{and}\quad \tilde{p}=\frac{p+p_0}{2}$$

and using the log-convexity of the L^q-norms we get

$$\|V_Mg-V_Ng\|_{L^p}^p \le \|V_Mg-V_Ng\|_{L^2}^a\|V_Mg-V_Ng\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}^{p-a}.$$

Since $(V_Ng : N\in\mathbb{N})$ converges in $L^2(\Omega_0)$ and is uniformly bounded on $L^{\tilde{p}}(\Omega_0)$ it is a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(\Omega_0)$. For an arbitrary $f\in L^p(\Omega_0)$ use the density of g's as above. We have

$$\|V_Mf-V_Nf\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f-g\|_{L^p}+\|V_Ng-V_Mg\|_{L^p}.$$

Thus $(V_Nf : N\in\mathbb{N})$ also converges, and this finishes the proof of the theorem. □

4. Double Differences

The martingale transforms are expressed in terms of double differences defined for a martingale $f=(f_\lambda : \lambda\in P)$ as

$$d_\lambda f = f_\lambda - f_{\lambda-\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda-\lambda_2} + f_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}.$$

4.1. Martingale transforms.

The following proposition is our key tool.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f\in L^2(\Omega_0)$ and $\lambda\in P$. If $f_{\lambda-j\lambda_1}=0$ for $j\in\mathbb{N}$ then for each $k\ge j$*

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\right\|_{L^2} \le 2q^{-(k-j+1)/2}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}.$$

Analogously, for λ_1 and λ_2 exchanged.

Proof. Suppose $j=1$. We are going to show that if $f_{\lambda-\lambda_1}=0$ then for all $k\ge 1$

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\right\|_{L^2} \le q^{-k/2}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}. \tag{4.1}$$

Indeed, if $k=1$ then by (2.1) of Lemma 2.2

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1+\lambda_2}]\right\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1+\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda], f_\lambda\rangle\\ &= q^{-1}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 - q^{-1}\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\vee\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}]\right\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

If $k>1$, we use Lemma 2.3 to write

$$\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}] = \mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}].$$

Since, by Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}] = \mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}] = 0$$

we can use induction to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\right\|_{L^2} &\le q^{-(k-1)/2}\left\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\right\|_{L^2}\\ &\le q^{-k/2}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider $j > 1$. For each $i = 0, 1, \dots, j-1$ we set

$$g_i = f_{\lambda - i\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda-(i+1)\lambda_1}.$$

By Lemma 2.4 and (4.1)

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\mathbb{E}[g_i|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\big\|_{L^2} = \big\|\mathbb{E}[g_i|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)-i\lambda_2}]\big\|_{L^2} &\le q^{-(k-i)/2}\|g_i\|_{L^2} \\ &\le q^{-(k-i)/2}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\mathbb{E}[f_\lambda|\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\big\|_{L^2} &\le \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}\big\|\mathbb{E}[g_i|\mathcal{F}_{n-k(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}]\big\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} q^{-(k-i)/2}\|f_\lambda\|_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof since

$$\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} q^{i/2} \le 2q^{(j-1)/2}. \qquad \square$$

We have the following

Proposition 4.2. *For any $\lambda, \lambda', \mu \in P$ and $m \ge 1$*

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|D_\lambda d_\mu^m D_{\lambda'}\big\|_{L^2\to L^2} &\lesssim q^{-|\mu-\lambda|/4}q^{-|\mu-\lambda'|/4}, \\ \big\|d_\lambda^m d_\mu^m\big\|_{L^2\to L^2} &\lesssim q^{-|\lambda-\mu|/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We observe that for $f \in L^2(\Omega_0)$, $d_\mu f \in L^2(\pi, \mathcal{F}_\mu)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\nu] = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

whenever $\langle \nu, \alpha_0\rangle \le \langle \mu, \alpha_0\rangle - 2$. For the proof it is enough to analyze the case $\nu = \mu - 2\lambda_2$. By Lemma 2.4, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{\mu-\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-2\lambda_2}] = \mathbb{E}[f_{\mu-\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-2\lambda_2}] = \mathbb{E}[f_{\mu-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-2\lambda_2}].$$

Suppose $\lambda = i\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$. Let us consider $R_j d_\mu$. If $j \ge \langle \mu, \alpha_2\rangle + 1$ then $R_j d_\mu f = 0$. For $j \le \langle \mu, \alpha_2\rangle - 2$, in view of (4.2) we can use Proposition 4.1 to estimate

$$\|R_j d_\mu f\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda, \alpha_2\rangle/2}\|d_\mu f\|_{L^2}. \tag{4.3}$$

Next, if $\langle \lambda, \alpha_0\rangle \ge \langle \mu, \alpha_0\rangle + 2$ then $D_\lambda d_\mu f = 0$, because $d_\mu f$ is $\mathcal{F}_\mu$-measurable. For $\langle \lambda, \alpha_0\rangle \le \langle \mu, \alpha_0\rangle - 4$ and $\langle \lambda, \alpha_2\rangle \le \langle \mu, \alpha_2\rangle$, by Lemma 2.5 we can write $D_\lambda d_\mu f = L_i g$ where

$$g = \mathbb{E}[R_j d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\nu]$$

and $\nu = (\langle \mu, \alpha_0\rangle - j)\lambda_1 + j\lambda_2$. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$R_j d_\mu f = \mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\nu] - \mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_{\nu+\lambda_1-\lambda_2}].$$

We notice that by Lemma 2.4 and (4.2)

$$\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\nu|\mathcal{F}_{\nu-2\lambda_1}] = \mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-2\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu-2\lambda_1}] = 0.$$

Similarly, one can show

$$\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_{\nu+\lambda_1-\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_{\nu-2\lambda_1}] = 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{\nu-2\lambda_1}] = 0$. Now, by Proposition 4.1, we obtain

$$\|L_i g\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \nu-\lambda, \alpha_0\rangle/2}\|R_j d_\mu f\|_{L^2}. \tag{4.4}$$

Combining (4.4) with (4.3) we get

$$\|D_\lambda d_\mu f\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda, \alpha_0\rangle/2}q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda, \alpha_2\rangle/2}\|d_\mu f\|_{L^2} \tag{4.5}$$

since $\langle \nu, \alpha_0\rangle = \langle \mu, \alpha_0\rangle$. By analogous reasoning one can show the corresponding norm estimates for $D^\star_{\lambda'} d_\mu$. Hence, taking adjoint

$$\|d_\mu D_{\lambda'} f\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda', \alpha_0\rangle/2}q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda', \alpha_2\rangle/2}\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{4.6}$$

Finally, (4.5) and (4.6) allow us to conclude the proof of the first inequality.

For the second, we may assume $0 \le \langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle \le 1$. Suppose $\langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_2 \rangle \ge 2$. Since $d_\mu f \in L^2(\pi, \mathcal{F}_\mu)$, by (4.2) and Proposition 4.1

$$\|\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda]\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda, \alpha_2\rangle/2} \|d_\mu f\|_{L^2}.$$

Similarly, we deal with the case $\langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_0 \rangle = 1$. We can assume $\langle \mu - \lambda, \alpha_2 \rangle \ge 1$. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda] = \mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_{\mu-\lambda_2}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda] = \mathbb{E}[f_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2} - f_{\lambda-\lambda_1}|\mathcal{F}_\lambda].$$

Hence, by Proposition 4.1

$$\|\mathbb{E}[d_\mu f|\mathcal{F}_\lambda]\|_{L^2} \lesssim q^{-\langle \mu-\lambda, \alpha_2\rangle/2} \|f\|_{L^2}. \qquad \square$$

Let $(a_\lambda : \lambda \in P)$ be an uniformly bounded *predictable* family of functions, i.e. each function a_λ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}$ and

$$\sup_{\omega\in\Omega_0} |a_\lambda(\omega)| \le M.$$

Predictability is the condition needed to ensure that $d_\lambda\big(a_\lambda f\big) = a_\lambda d_\lambda f$. By Theorem 3, Theorem 1, Proposition 4.2 and duality when $p > 2$, we get

Theorem 4. *For each $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the series*

$$\sum_{\lambda\in P} a_\lambda d_\lambda^m$$

converges unconditionally in the strong operator topology for the operators on $L^p(\Omega_0)$, and defines the operator with norm bounded by a constant multiply of

$$\sup_{\lambda\in P}\sup_{\omega\in\Omega_0} |a_\lambda(\omega)|.$$

4.2. **Martingale square function.** For a martingale $f = (f_\lambda : \lambda \in P)$ there is the natural square function defined by

$$Sf = \Big(\sum_{\lambda\in P} (d_\lambda f)^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Although S does not preserve L^2 norm we have

Theorem 5. *For every $p \in (1, \infty)$ there is $C_p > 0$ such that*

$$C_p^{-1}\|f\|_{L^p} \le \|Sf\|_{L^p} \le C_p\|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Proof. We start from proving the identity

$$d_\lambda^4 - d_\lambda^3 - q^{-1}d_\lambda^2 + q^{-1}d_\lambda = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Let us notice that

$$\begin{aligned} d_\lambda\mathbb{E}_\lambda &= d_\lambda, & d_\lambda\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2} &= 0,\\ d_\lambda\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2} &= -\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2} + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}, & d_\lambda\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1} &= -\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1} + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, consecutively we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_\lambda^2 &= d_\lambda + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2} + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1} - 2\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2},\\ d_\lambda^3 &= d_\lambda^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1} - \mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2} + 2\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2},\\ d_\lambda^4 &= d_\lambda^3 + (\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2})^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1})^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.2,

$$d_\lambda^4 = d_\lambda^3 + q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2} + q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_2}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1} - 2q^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda-\lambda_1-\lambda_2}$$

which together with (4.8) implies (4.7).

Next, we consider an operator $\mathcal{T}$ defined for a function $f \in L^p(\Omega_0)$ by

$$\mathcal{T}f = (d_\lambda f : \lambda \in P).$$

We also need an operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ acting on $g \in L^{p'}(\Omega_0)$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g = \big(-qd_\lambda^3 g + qd_\lambda^2 g + d_\lambda g : \lambda \in P\big).$$

We observe that by two parameter Khinchine's inequality and Theorem 4 we have

$$\big\|\mathcal{T}f\big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}, \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g\big\|_{L^{p'}(\ell^2)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^{p'}}.$$

The dual operator $\mathcal{T}^\star : L^{p'}\big(\pi, \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)\big) \to L^{p'}(\Omega_0)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T}^\star \vec{g} = \sum_{\lambda\in P} d_\lambda g_\lambda.$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g \in L^{p'}\big(\pi, \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)\big)$, by (4.7) and Theorem 4,

$$\mathcal{T}^\star\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g = \sum_{\lambda\in P} d_\lambda g = g$$

Therefore, by Cauchy–Schwarz and Hölder inequalities

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \langle f, \mathcal{T}^\star\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g\rangle \le \big\|\mathcal{T}f\big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)}\big\|\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}g\big\|_{L^{p'}(\ell^2)} \lesssim \big\|\mathcal{T}f\big\|_{L^p(\ell^2)}\|g\|_{L^{p'}}$$

and since $\|\mathcal{T}f\|_{L^p(\ell^2)} = \|Sf\|_{L^p}$ the proof is finished. □

Finally, the method of the proof of Theorem 3, together with Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 shows the following

Theorem 6. *Let $(T_\lambda : \lambda \in P)$ be a family of operators such that for some $\delta > 0$ and $p_0 \in (1, 2)$*

$$\|T_\lambda\|_{L^1\to L^1} \lesssim 1,$$
$$\|T_\mu T_\lambda^\star\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\mu-\lambda|} \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|T_\mu^\star T_\lambda\big\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\mu-\lambda|},$$
$$\|d_\lambda T_\mu d_{\lambda'}\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim q^{-\delta|\lambda-\mu|}q^{-\delta|\lambda'-\mu|},$$
$$\Big\|\sup_{\lambda\in P}|T_\lambda f_\lambda|\Big\|_{L^{p_0}} \lesssim \Big\|\sup_{\lambda}|f_\lambda|\Big\|_{L^{p_0}}.$$

Then for any $p \in (p_0, 2]$ the sum $\sum_{\lambda\in P} T_\lambda$ converges unconditionally in the strong operator topology for the operators on $L^p(\Omega_0)$.

Appendix A. About Ω_0 and Heisenberg group

In some cases Ω_0 can be identified with a Heisenberg group over a nonarchimedean local field. Let us recall, that F is a *nonarchimedean local field* if it is a topological field [1] that is locally compact, second countable, non-discrete and totally disconnected. Since F together with the additive structure is a locally compact topological group it has a Haar measure μ that is unique up to multiplicative constant. Observe that for each $x \in F$, the measure $\mu_x(B) = \mu(xB)$ is also a Haar measure. We set

$$|x| = \frac{\mu_x(B)}{\mu(B)},$$

where B is any measurable set with finite and positive measure. By $\mathcal{O} = \{x \in F : |x| \le 1\}$, we denote the ring of integers in F. We fix $\pi \in \mathfrak{p} - \mathfrak{p}^2$, where

$$\mathfrak{p} = \big\{x \in F : |x| < 1\big\}.$$

We are going to sketch the construction of a building associated to $\mathrm{GL}(3, F)$. For more details we refer to [14]. A lattice is a subset $L \subset F^3$ of the form

$$L = \mathcal{O}v_1 + \mathcal{O}v_2 + \mathcal{O}v_3,$$

where $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is a basis of F^3. We say that two lattices L_1 and L_2 are equivalent if and only if $L_1 = aL_2$ for some nonzero $a \in F$. Then $\mathscr{X}$, the building of $\mathrm{GL}(3, F)$, is the set of equivalence classes of lattices in F^3. For $x, y \in \mathscr{X}$ there are a basis $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ of F^3 and integers $j_1 \le j_2 \le j_3$ such that (see [14, Proposition 3.1])

$$x = \mathcal{O}v_1 + \mathcal{O}v_2 + \mathcal{O}v_3, \quad \text{and} \quad y = \pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3.$$

We say that x and y are joined by an edge if and only if $0 = j_1 \le j_2 \le j_3 = 1$. The subset

$$\mathscr{A} = \big\{\pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\big\}$$

[1] A *topological field* is an algebraic field with a topology making addition, multiplication and multiplicative inverse a continuous mappings.

is called an apartment. A sector in $\mathscr{A}$ is a subset of the form

$$\mathcal{S} = \{x + \pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_{\sigma(1)} \le j_{\sigma(2)} \le j_{\sigma(3)}, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

where σ is a permutation of $\{1,2,3\}$ and $x \in \mathscr{A}$. Thus, a subsector of $\mathcal{S}$ is

$$\{x + \pi^{k_1+j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{k_2+j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{k_3+j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_{\sigma(1)} \le j_{\sigma(2)} \le j_{\sigma(3)}, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

for some $0 \le k_{\sigma(1)} \le k_{\sigma(2)} \le k_{\sigma(3)}$. Finally, two sectors

$$\mathcal{S} = \{x + \pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_{\sigma(1)} \le j_{\sigma(2)} \le j_{\sigma(3)}, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}' = \{x' + \pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_{\sigma'(1)} \le j_{\sigma'(2)} \le j_{\sigma'(3)}, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

are opposite if $\sigma' \circ \sigma^{-1} = (3\,2\,1)$.

A sector in $\mathscr{X}$ is a sector in one of its apartments. Two sectors in $\mathscr{X}$ are equivalent if and only if its intersection contains a sector. By Ω we denote the equivalence classes of sectors in $\mathscr{X}$. Let ω_0 and ω_0' be the equivalence class of

$$\mathscr{S}_0 = \{\pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}e_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}e_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}e_3 : j_1 \le j_2 \le j_3, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

and

$$\mathscr{S}_0' = \{\pi^{j_1}\mathcal{O}e_1 + \pi^{j_2}\mathcal{O}e_2 + \pi^{j_3}\mathcal{O}e_3 : j_1 \ge j_2 \ge j_3, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

respectively. Two sectors $\mathscr{S}$ and $\mathscr{S}'$ are opposite in $\mathscr{X}$ if there are subsectors of $\mathscr{S}$ and $\mathscr{S}'$ opposite in a common apartment. By Ω_0 we denote the equivalence classes of sectors opposite to $\mathscr{S}_0$.

Suppose that $\omega' \in \Omega_0$. Let $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ be a basis of F^3, and $k_1 \le k_2 \le k_3$ and $k_1' \ge k_2' \ge k_3'$ be integers such that

$$\{\pi^{j_1+k_1}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2+k_2}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3+k_3}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_1 \le j_2 \le j_3, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \tag{A.1}$$

and

$$\{\pi^{j_1+k_1'}\mathcal{O}v_1 + \pi^{j_2+k_2'}\mathcal{O}v_2 + \pi^{j_3+k_3'}\mathcal{O}v_3 : j_1 \ge j_2 \ge j_3, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \tag{A.2}$$

belong to ω_0 and ω', respectively. Since the sector (A.1) belongs to ω_0, we have

$$v_1 = b_{11}e_1, \quad v_2 = b_{21}e_1 + b_{22}e_2, \quad v_3 = b_{31}e_1 + b_{32}e_2 + b_{33}e_3,$$

for some $b_{ij} \in F$ such that $b_{11}, b_{22}, b_{33} \ne 0$. Hence, the matrix

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{21} & b_{31} \\ 0 & b_{22} & b_{32} \\ 0 & 0 & b_{33} \end{pmatrix},$$

satisfies $ge_j = v_j$. In particular, $g\omega_0' = \omega'$. Therefore, the group of upper triangular matrices acts transitively on Ω_0. Observe also that the stabilizer of ω_0' in $\mathrm{GL}(3,F)$ is the group of lower triangular matrices. Thus the group

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : x, y, z \in F \right\}$$

acts simply transitively on Ω_0.

References

[1] N. Bourbaki. *Groupes et algèbres de Lie*. Hermann, Paris, 1968.
[2] D. Burkholder. Martingale transforms. *Ann. Stat.*, 37:1494–1504, 1966.
[3] D. Burkholder. Distribution function inequalities for martingales. *Ann. Probab.*, 1:19–42, 1973.
[4] D. Burkholder. The best constant in the Davis inequality for the expectation of the martingale square function. *T. Am. Math. Soc.*, 354(1):91–105, 2001.
[5] R. Cairoli and J. Walsh. Stochastic integrals in the plane. *Acta Math.-Djursholm*, 134(1):111–183, 1975.
[6] J. Duoandikoetxea and J. Rubio de Francia. Maximal and singular integral operators via Fourier transform estimates. *Invent. Math.*, 84(3):541–561, 1986.
[7] R. Gundy. A decomposition of L^1 bounded martingales. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 39:134–138, 1968.
[8] G. Hardy and J. Littlewood. A maximal theorem with function-theoretic applications. *Acta Math.*, 54:81–161, 1930.
[9] J. Jensen, J. Marcinkiewicz, and A. Zygmund. Note on the differentiability of multiple integrals. *Fund. Math.*, 25:217–234, 1935.

[10] J. Marcinkiewicz. Quelques théorèmes sur les séris orthogonales. *Ann. Soc. Polon. Math.*, 16:84–96, 1937.
[11] C. Metraux. Quelques inégalités pour martingales à parameter bidimensional. In C. Dellacherie, P. A. Meyer, and M. Weil, editors, *Séminaire de Probabilités XII*, volume 649 of *Lect. Notes Math.*, pages 170–179. Springer–Verlag, 1978.
[12] R. Paley. A remarkable series series of orthogonal functions (I). *P. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 34:241–279, 1932.
[13] M. Ronan. *Lectures on Buildings*. Perspectives in Mathematics. Academic Press, 1989.
[14] T. Steger. Local Fields and Buildings. In A. Koranyi, editor, *Harmonic Functions on Trees and Buildings*, volume 206 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 79–107. Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.
[15] E. Stein. *Topics in Harmonic Analysis Related to the Littlewood–Paley Theory*. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, 1970.
[16] E. Stein and T. Murphy. *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*. Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, 1993.
[17] E. Stein and B. Street. Multi-parameter singular Radon transforms II: the L^p theory. *Adv. Math.*, 248:736–783, 2013.
[18] F. Weisz. *Martingale Hardy spaces and their applications in Fourier analysis*, volume 1568 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
[19] E. Wong and M. Zakai. Martingales and stochastic integrals for processes with a multidimensional parameter. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete*, 29:109–122, 1974.
[20] M. Zakai. Some classes of two-parameter martingales. *Ann. Prob.*, 9(2):255–265, 1981.

Tim Steger, Matematica, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Via Piandanna 4, 07100 Sassari, Italy
E-mail address: steger@uniss.it

Bartosz Trojan, Wydział Matematyki, Politechnika Wrocławska, Wyb. Wyspiańskiego 27, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland
E-mail address: bartosz.trojan@pwr.edu.pl